

### REMARKS

In the Action mailed August 9, 2005, the Examiner rejected all pending claims 1-8, 10-16 and 23-28. Applicants have amended all of the independent claims 1, 10 and 23 above. As such, claims 1-8, 10-16 and 23-28 remain pending. Applicants request reconsideration of claims 1-8, 10-16 and 23-28 in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

#### **Claim Amendments in View of Examiner Remarks regarding Examiner Interview**

In the response filed July 28, 2005, Applicants amended independent claims 1, 10 and 23 in an attempt to apply the audio-only mode of operation to a system level to overcome the Kashida and Abbott references as discussed with the Examiner in an interview, and to do so, Applicants used the terminology of a "human-machine interface" in the claim to describe the interface at a system level. In the most recent Action, the Examiner contended that these claim amendments do not exclude the system from comprising a second human machine interface, and contended that the claim "human-machine interface" may have a non-audio-only mode of operation.

In view of the Examiner's position, Applicants have further amended each of the independent claims to recite that the claimed human-machine interface with the audio-only mode of operation serves as the only interface for the user when the computer unit is worn by the user. In addition, Applicants have amended each of the independent claims to recite that the claimed human-machine interface with the audio-only mode of operation has no visual mode of operation.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 and § 103**

The Examiner rejected each of the pending independent claims 1, 10 and 23 as being anticipated by, or rendered obvious in view of, various cited references. As just discussed, Applicants have amended each of claims 1, 10 and 23 as discussed in the Examiner interview, and as clarified in the Examiner's most recent Action. Accordingly, Applicants ask that the

Examiner remove his rejection of independent claims 1, 10 and 23, as well his rejection of dependent claims 2-8, 11-16 and 24-28.

### Conclusion


Applicants submit that pending claims 1-8, 10-16 and 23-28 are in condition for allowance, and ask that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to amendment.

It is believed that no fee is due for this Amendment. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Date: 11-9-05

Respectfully submitted,



John A. Dragseth  
Reg. No. 42,497

Fish & Richardson P.C., P.A.  
60 South Sixth Street  
Suite 3300  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 335-5070  
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696